

REMARKS

Claims 26-33, as previously presented, and claims 41-54, as amended, are pending in this application. In this Response, Applicants have amended certain claims because Applicants believe these amendments serve a useful clarification purpose, and are desirable for clarification purposes, independent of patentability. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim amendments do not limit the range of any permissible equivalents.

In particular, claims 41-54 have been rewritten as discussed below. As no new matter has been added by the amendments herein, Applicants respectfully request entry of these amendments at this time.

ELECTIONS/RESTRICTIONS

The Examiner indicated that claims 41-54 were withdrawn from consideration as being directed to an independent invention. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of the subject matter of these claims. As explained in greater detail in the Written Description, the polymeric composite of the present invention can provide a "bale" of polybutadiene or other blended polymeric material for use in a golf ball. *See, e.g.*, Written Description at Page 10, lines 31-33. In particular, the polymeric composite including at least two polymer materials can be advantageously formed into bales of the composite material. *Id.* at Page 10, line 35 to Page 11, line 1. Prior to forming the polymeric composite into a bale, however, the polymeric composite is solution blended. *Id.* at Page 8, line 34 to Page 9, line 2. As such, the "bale" in claims 41 and 49 originates from a solution blended polymeric composite.

In order to clarify this aspect of the invention, claims 41 and 49 have been rewritten to recite "a bale of solution blended polymeric material." In light of this explanation and amendment, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider claims 41-54.

DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION

The Examiner rejected claims 26-33 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as obvious over claims 1-15 and 20-23 of the parent application (U.S. Patent No. 6,710,114 to Bissonnette *et al.*). Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer

in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c) in order to overcome the double patenting rejection. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NUMBER

A copy of the Request for Change in Attorney Docket Number previously submitted December 22, 2004 is attached. Applicants respectfully request recognition of the change from 20002.0092A to 20002.0400 in future correspondence relating to this application.

CONCLUSION


All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that the present amendments still do not resolve all of the issues regarding patentability of the pending claims, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorneys to discuss any remaining issues.

A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith to extend the time for response two months to and including August 25, 2005. In addition, a Fee Sheet Transmittal is included to authorize payment of the extension and the fee for the Terminal Disclaimer. No other fees are believed to be due at this time. Should any fee be required, however, please charge such fee to Swidler Berlin LLP Deposit Account No. 195127, Order No. 20002.0400.

Respectfully submitted,

SWIDLER BERLIN LLP

Dated: August 15, 2005

By: 
Stephanie D. Scruggs, Registration No. 54,432
SWIDLER BERLIN LLP
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 424-7755 Telephone
(202) 295-8478 Facsimile